- 6 -

Remarks/Argument

The Applicant respectfully traverses the Examiner's conclusion that claims 1 through 4 are unpatentable in light of DeMoney, Jain and Goldberg for the following reasons.

Jain discloses the use of a timestamp to compute a playout time for each packet, which is then released to the playout device at the appropriate playout time. This is quite different from the present invention which sets a _deadline_, by which the message must be played. Jain simply schedules the packet for play at its appropriate time. When that time arrives, the packet is released for playback. A deadline is irrelevant in Jain, as the packet is scheduled and then released at its appropriate time, whereas in the present invention, the deadline (i.e. the latest time in which the message can be played) is the time under consideration.

The Applicant has added new claims 5 through 8, dependent on claims 1 through 4, respectively, which include another feature, namely the calculation of a factor by which to accelerate the animation that is based on dividing the time required to play all of the currently queued animation by the minimum deadline of each of the messages in the queue. The use of this factor is not found in the prior art.

Given the above remarks, the Applicant respectfully submits the Application is in condition for allowance, and respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued.

Respectfully submitted,

By:

Daniel R. Polonenko
c/o Fasken Martineau DuMoulin LLP
Suite 2100, 1075 West Georgia Street
Vancouver, British Columbia V6E 3G2
Tel: 604-631-4743
Fax: 604-632-4743

DM_VAN/260331-00004/6762860.1

PAGE 12/12 * RCVD AT 11/5/2007 6:09:45 PM [Eastern Standard Time] * SVR:USPTO-EFXRF-1/7 * DNIS:2738300 * CSID:604 631 3232 * DURATION (mm-ss):04-10